



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/810,367	03/16/2001	Gustavo R. Rivera	COVA-003/00US	9210

22903 7590 05/04/2005

COOLEY GODWARD LLP  
ATTN: PATENT GROUP  
11951 FREEDOM DRIVE, SUITE 1700  
ONE FREEDOM SQUARE- RESTON TOWN CENTER  
RESTON, VA 20190-5061

EXAMINER

ZHONG, CHAD

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2152

DATE MAILED: 05/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/810,367

Applicant(s)

RIVERA ET AL.

Examiner

Chad Zhong

Art Unit

2152

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 December 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 10-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 10-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 July 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**FINAL ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed on 12/28/2004. This action has been made final.

Claims 10-18 are presented for examination. In amendment A, filed on 12/28/2004: Claims 1-9 and 19-24 are cancelled.

Claims 10-18 are previously presented

2. It is noted that although the present application does contain line numbers in specification and claims, the line numbers in the claims do not correspond to the preferred format. The preferred format is to number each line of every claim, with each claim beginning with line 1. For ease of reference by both the Examiner and Applicant all future correspondence should include the recommended line numbering.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 10-18 are rejected 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeRose et al. (hereinafter DeRose), US 6,167,409 in view of Mehra et al. (hereinafter Mehra), US 2002/0049603.

7. As per claim 10, DeRose teaches a method for viewing documents electronically stored in a central repository, the method comprises:

receiving, from a user, a request to access at least one document related to the operational

Art Unit: 2152

process (Col. 5, lines 47-51);

identifying the first document and the second document as being associated with the operational process (Col. 16, lines 30-40; Col. 9, lines 10-20);

retrieving a format instruction associated with the user and the requested document (Col. 13, lines 25-35);

retrieving data associated with the at least one document; and

rendering the retrieved data according to the retrieved format instruction (Col. 14, lines 45-50; Col. 13, lines 27-36; Col. 14, lines 32-40).

8. DeRose does not explicitly mention

receiving a first document from a first originating party, wherein the first document is associated with an operational process;

storing the first document in the central repository;

receiving a second document from a second originating party, wherein the second document is associated with the operational process;

storing the second document in the central repository;

9. Mehra teaches

receiving a first document from a first originating party (item 617, Fig 6), wherein the first document is associated with an operational process ([0221-0223], [0564], [0573], [0587], the files loaded on to the central server are documents, the operating process would be the process of updating the centralized catalog by plurality of providers, i.e. metadata);

storing the first document in the central repository (Fig 6, item 609);

receiving a second document from a second originating party (item 617, Fig 6), wherein the second document is associated with the operational process (the operating process would be the process of updating the centralized catalog by plurality of providers, i.e. metadata);

Art Unit: 2152

storing the second document in the central repository (pg 1, [0017]-[0018]; see for example, Fig 6, item 617; Fig 5, item 509, wherein the data for the central repository 609, 613 are provided by a plurality of publishers/content providers for the advantages of creating an updated catalog, pg 6, [0202]);

10. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention was made to combine the teaching of DeRose and Mehra because they both dealing with central storage of information on a server for future retrieval by clients. Furthermore, the teaching of Mehra to allow

receiving a first document from a first originating party, wherein the first document is associated with an operational process;

storing the first document in the central repository;

receiving a second document from a second originating party, wherein the second document is associated with the operational process;

storing the second document in the central repository;

would improve the functionality for DeRose's system by allowing for various originating parties to store information data towards a centralized location that deals with the same operational process, providing platform independent operations (pg 1, [0013]).

11. As per claim 11, DeRose teaches the method of claim 10, further comprising:

displaying an identifier for the first document and the second document in a hierarchical arrangement (Col. 7, lines 60-67).

12. As per claim 12, DeRose teaches the method of claim 10, further comprising:

receiving a user identifier associated with the user attempting to access the at least one document (Col. 9, lines 1-5);

Art Unit: 2152

retrieving relationship data associated with the user (Col. 9, lines 1-5); and

restricting access to the first document and not the second document responsive to the user identifier being associated with a restricted user identifier (Col. 9, lines 1-5; Col. 15, lines 5-10).

13. As per claims 13-16, Claims 13-16 are rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claims 5-8 above respectively.

14. As per claim 17, DeRose does not explicitly teach the method of claim 10, wherein the operational process comprises a business process.

15. Mehra teaches the method of claim 10, wherein the operational process comprises a business process (pg 1, [0015]).

16. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention was made to combine the teaching of DeRose and Mehra because they both dealing with central storage of information on a server. Furthermore, the teaching of Mehra to allow wherein the operational process comprises a business process would improve the functionality for DeRose's system by allowing for usage of the system in a business environment.

17. As per claim 18, DeRose does not explicitly teaches the method of claim 10, wherein the first originating party and the second originating party are different originating parties.

18. Mehra teaches the method of claim 10, wherein the first originating party and the second originating party are different originating parties ( pg 1, [0017]-[0018] ).

19. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention was made to combine the teaching of DeRose and Mehra because they both dealing with central storage of information on a server. Furthermore, the teaching of Mehra to allow

Art Unit: 2152

wherein the first originating party and the second originating party are different originating parties

would improve the functionality for DeRose's system by allowing for data to be gathered from multiple locations be located at a central location.

### *Conclusion*

20. Applicant's remarks filed 12/28/04 have been considered but are found not persuasive.

21. In the remark, the applicant argued in substance that Mehra fails to disclose or suggest receiving and storing a first document from a first originating party and then receiving and storing a second document from a second originating party wherein both the first and the second documents are associated with the same operational process.

In response to applicant's amendment, Mehra teaches the above sections.

Referring to Fig 6, plurality of providers provide updates to the centralized learning catalog, in order to be retrieved by learners at a later point in time. Thus, the document storing process towards a centralized database is realized.

22. In the remark, the applicant argued in substance that Mehra fails to disclose or suggest motivation to combine with DeRose or any other reference.

In response to Applicant's arguments, one exemplary motivation to combine would be to improve the efficiency for DeRose's system by allowing for various originating parties to store information data towards a centralized location that deals with the same operational process, providing platform independent operations as shown in pg 1, [0013].

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reined of the extension of time policy as set

Art Unit: 2152

forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following patents and publications are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to "SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR RENDERING DOCUMENTS IN A USER FAMILIAR FORMAT".

- i. US 6578192 Boehme et al.
- ii. US 2003/0133145 Koppich et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chad Zhong whose telephone number is (571)272-3946. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:15 to 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, BURGESS, GLENTON B can be reached on (571)272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished



Art Unit: 2152

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CZ

March 9, 2005

 JOHN FOLLANSBEE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100